THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

# NOMINATIONS AS A TECHNIQUE FOR IDENTIFYING POTENTIAL PRINCIPALS

by

HERMAN ARNOLD WALLIN

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES

IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE

OF MASTER OF EDUCATION

DIVISION OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

EDMONTON, ALBERTA
OCTOBER, 1962

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies for acceptance, a thesis entitled "Nominations As A Technique For Identifying Potential Principals," submitted by Herman Arnold Wallin in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Education.

ABSTRACT

A growing number of aspirants to leadership positions in education is confronting superintendents and school boards with the difficult task of choosing wisely the most likely candidates from among a field of many applicants. Recent literature dealing with selection suggests that there are four dimensions to the task of choosing people to administer the schools: identification (the early recognition of potential talent), attraction (recruitment), professional development (on-the-job preparation), and selection (this particular step can only be made by those who employ or operate professional programs). This thesis examines nominations as a technique for the early identification of potential principals.

The study involved the staffs of 17 elementary-junior high schools and 3 general supervisors of instruction located in a large urban school system. There were four distinct groups in this sample of 441 persons: teachers, vice-principals, principals, and supervisors. All participants were given an opportunity to nominate persons that were believed to be potential principals, as well as persons that were believed to be unsuited for the principalship.

Listed are three of the questions that were examined. (1) Are there differences in characteristics of nominees for each of the four nominating groups? (2) Are there differences among the three classes of nominees, i.e. potential principals, teachers unsuited for the

principalship, and those teachers not included in the two aforementioned classes? (3) To what extent do the nominators agree?

In answer to the first question posed it was found that, in general, no significant differences existed among the four groups of nominees. Only with respect to years of training of potential principals was there a significant difference: vice-principal and supervisor nominees possessed less training than did principal and teacher nominees. The answer to the second question was 'yes.' Compared with the other two classes of nominees, a greater percentage of potential principals were males and were married. Potential principals had more training, more teaching experience, and more administrative experience. Further, a greater percentage aspired to the principalship. Regarding age and self-evaluation of potential administrative effectiveness, potential principals were not unlike the other two classes. With respect to the third question, more of the principal nominees were found among other nominee groups, and hence were those on whom there was the most agreement. Supervisor nominees tended to be the most controversial; a greater percentage of these nominees were identified by one or more of the other three nominator groups as unsuited for the principalship.

The study revealed that educator groups other than the superintendent and his assistants are willing and interested in identifying potential leaders; further, it would seem important that at least some of the persons engaged in identifying be closely associated with

teachers in the field, and it appears that principals would be reliable members on the identification team. Finally, it is apparent that nominators employed criteria other than factors such as age, length of service and years of training in predicting potentiality; it is possible that an intuitive type of assessment was made of these unmeasurable qualities important for the kind of educational leadership required in a changing society.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writer is indebted to the teachers, vice-principals, principals, and general supervisors of instruction for their cooperation in the collection of the basic data used in this study. Financial assistance for this study was provided by a Faculty of Education Teaching Fellowship.

The guidance and encouragement received from the chairman, Dr. J.H.M. Andrews, and the assistance which was received from Dr. G.L. Mowat and Dr. W.H. Worth have been much appreciated.

TABLE OF CONTENTS


| CHAPTER | | PAGE |
|---|---|---|
| I. | THE PROBLEM . . . . . | 1 |
| | Introduction . . . . . | 1 |
| | The General Problem . . . . . | 1 |
| | The Specific Problem: Identifying Potential Leaders . . . . . | 4 |
| | Statement of the Problem . . . . . | 7 |
| | General Procedure and Sub-Problems . . | 7 |
| | Definition of Terms . . . . . | 8 |
| | Limitations of the Study . . . . . | 9 |
| II. | A GENERAL SURVEY OF RELATED LITERATURE . . | 10 |
| | Conventional Selection Devices and Procedures . . . . . | 11 |
| | Modern Identification and Selection Processes . . . . . | 14 |
| | Evaluation techniques . . . . . | 15 |
| | Selection procedures . . . . . | 18 |
| | Summary . . . . . | 21 |
| III. | RESEARCH PROCEDURES . . . . . | 22 |
| | Design of the Study . . . . . | 22 |
| | Instrumentation . . . . . | 25 |
| | Collection of Data . . . . . | 28 |
| | The Nominators . . . . . | 28 |
| | The Pilot Study . . . . . | 29 |
| | Reporting of Results . . . . . | 29 |

CHAPTER PAGE

IV. CHARACTERISTICS OF TEACHERS, VICE-PRINCIPALS AND PRINCIPALS IN THE SAMPLE . . . . . 31

V. COMPARISON OF CERTAIN CHARACTERISTICS OF POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE NOMINEES ACCORDING TO SOURCE OF NOMINATION . . . . . 41

Positive Nominees . . . . . 41

Summary . . . . . 47

Negative Nominees . . . . . 48

Summary . . . . . 53

VI. COMPARISON OF CHARACTERISTICS AMONG POSITIVE, NEGATIVE, AND NEUTRAL NOMINEES . . . . . 54

Summary . . . . . 64

VII. EXTENT OF AGREEMENT AMONG NOMINATORS AND CONCLUSIONS . . . . . 66

Extent of Agreement Among Nominators . . . . 66

Positive Nominees: Agreement and Contradiction . . . . . 67

Negative Nominees: Agreement and Contradiction . . . . . 69

Summary . . . . . 70

A Review Of The Findings . . . . . 72

Implications Of The Findings . . . . . 75

BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . . 80

APPENDICES . . . . . 82

APPENDIX A. Nomination Form and Biographical Data Sheet . . . . . 83

APPENDIX B. Letter of Authorization - Alberta Teachers' Association . . . . . 86

APPENDIX C. Letter of Authorization - Edmonton Public School Board . . . . . 87

LIST OF TABLES


| TABLE | | PAGE |
|---|---|---|
| I. | Characteristics of Leadership: In Terms of Degree of Amenability to Known Testing Devices* | 16 |
| II. | Method Used to Determine Staff Nominees | 24 |
| III. | Table III | 27 |
| IV. | Sex and Age of Sample | 32 |
| V. | Marital Status of Sample | 33 |
| VI. | Years of Training of Sample | 34 |
| VII. | Years of Teaching Experience of Sample | 35 |
| VIII. | Years of Teaching Experience in the System | 36 |
| IX. | Years of Administrative Experience | 37 |
| X. | Aspirations of Teachers in the Sample | 38 |
| XI. | Self-Rating on Potential Effectiveness as Principal | 39 |
| XII. | Age of Positive Nominees | 41 |
| XIII. | Professional Training of Positive Nominees | 42 |
| XIV. | Teaching Experience of Positive Nominees | 44 |
| XV. | System Teaching Experience of Positive Nominees | 45 |
| XVI. | Administrative Experience of Positive Nominees | 46 |
| XVII. | Age of Negative Nominees | 49 |
| XVIII. | Professional Training of Negative Nominees | 50 |
| XIX. | Teaching Experience of Negative Nominees | 51 |

TABLE PAGE


XX. System Teaching Experience of Negative Nominees . . . . . 52

XXI. Administrative Experience of Negative Nominees . . . . . 53

XXII. Sex of Nominees . . . . . 55

XXIII. Age of Nominees . . . . . 56

XXIV. Marital Status of Nominees . . . . . 57

XXV. Professional Training of Nominees . . . . . 58

XXVI. Total Teaching Experience of Nominees . . . . 59

XXVII. System Teaching Experience of Nominees . . . 60

XXVIII. Administrative Experience of Nominees . . . . 61

XXIX. Aspirations of Nominees . . . . . 62

XXX. Self Evaluation of Probable Administrative Effectiveness of Nominees . . . . . 63

# CHAPTER I

# THE PROBLEM

## I. INTRODUCTION

### The General Problem

Many school systems have been and continue to be faced with problems of rapid expansion. As this expansion continues

> ...the reservoir of trained leaders will soon run dry. Canadian school systems everywhere must now concentrate on the identification of potential leaders and provide a program for the rapid development of these persons.[1]

Perhaps one of the most pressing problems confronting Canadian school administrators today is the early identification of men with high leadership potential. There are several factors which serve to maintain the existence of the problem and decrease the likelihood of an easy solution. Campbell[2] mentioned that because of the sheer increase in the number of schools, more principals would be needed; further, the principal in urban areas is expected to assume a bigger role in administering his own school than ever before - a trend toward decentralization of decision making. It cannot be denied

---

[1]K.F. Preuter, "Executive Development Within a School System," Canadian Education, March, 1957, p. 30.

[2]Roald F. Campbell, "Selection and Preparation of School Principals," The Alberta School Principal - 1959. Edmonton: University of Alberta, 1959, p. 136.

that the public today expects the school to be and do much more than it ever did before.

Looking at the problem from another point of view, Orton[3] points out that as the number of capable candidates for each administrative position increases, the actual selection becomes increasingly difficult to make. In urban areas, where personnel turnover tends to be low and where, at the same time, most promotions are made within the staff, promotional tensions have increased partly due to the increasing number of young male teachers.

> There are those who like to work in schools, and there are among them those who like - even prefer - to lead. What is more to the point, there appears to be no shortage of those who would aspire to administrative positions in education.[4]

This abundance of aspirants confronts superintendents and school boards with the difficult task of choosing wisely the most likely candidates from among a field of many applicants.

Two assumptions appear implicit. First, that the number of persons aspiring to leadership positions in public education is greater than the number of positions to be filled; and second, that those persons possessing what it is that is required for really creative leadership are in short supply. These assumptions suggest four dimensions for the task of choosing people to administer the schools, and four lines of effort related to them.

---

[3]D.A. Orton, "Quality of Administrative Behavior Should Be Target for Change," The Nation's Schools, 63:50-51, January, 1959.

[4]American Association of School Administrators Yearbook, 1960 (Washington: National Education Association, 1960), p. 143.

The first of these dimensions is identification - the early recognition of potential talent.

> If indeed there does exist a plethora of people who long to administer, certainly it is only wise for those who choose administrators to have some means of sifting the lot and identifying the best.[5]

The second dimension is attraction, or recruitment. This refers to a systematic effort to direct the interests and aspirations of the persons possessing potential talent toward educational administration.

The third dimension for the task of choosing is a planned program for professional development. Some school systems call this step "on-the-job preparation." This kind of program can take many forms and can be aimed at any number of different goals. One such program in Fresno, California, is designed "to train administrators in both the procedural skills of administration and the human skills involved in working with people."[6] This dimension may become an aid to selecting competent personnel if extra "trainees" are added to the group so that the selective process can be continued up to the date of actual appointment.

The final dimension is selection and subsequent appointment to a specific post. In the literature there appears to be confusion about two of the tasks mentioned - identification and selection. For the purposes of this study the following difference is to be noted: many people, including the individual himself, are capable of identifying a potential administrator, while only those who employ or who

---

[5] Ibid., p. 144.
[6] Ibid., p. 170.

operate professional programs are equipped to take the further step of selection.

Chronologically speaking, attraction comes somewhere between identification and professional development or selection. However attraction is the responsibility of all those who function as identifiers. It is difficult to state that professional development precedes selection because the order varies according to the particular purposes the organization has in mind. It would appear that selection should follow professional development so that the latter might serve as an additional screening device.

This thesis will confine its attention to the first dimension - namely, identification.

## The Specific Problem: Identifying Potential Leaders

Who should participate in the identification of school principals? In common practice, the superintendent makes the decisions and submits his recommendations to the school board. Most frequently the decisions are made from a pool of self-nominated applicants. The literature suggests that there is a real necessity of getting all available and pertinent evidence about potential leaders. To use many, rather than few, techniques and evidences not only increases the likelihood that all persons concerned will view the process as being equitable but that the best possible choices will be made. McIntyre[7] reports in his

---

[7]K.E. McIntyre, Recruiting and Selecting Leaders for Education (Austin, Texas: Southwest School Administration Center, 1956), pp. 15, 16.

study "Recruiting and Selecting Leaders for Education" that the group nominated by principals excelled the other three groups on every measure except one. He further states that although the largest group, those nominated by superintendents, were not included in that particular aspect of the study, the averages of each total group were such as to indicate that the principal-nominated members also substantially excelled those nominated by superintendents, on every measure except one. This study points out clearly that the self-nominated group had the least favourable average scores and ranks on every measure.[8]

The AASA Yearbook - 1960 suggests that the most common identifier of potential talent to date has been the individual himself.[9]

> For altogether too long, the profession has relied on haphazard choice and random mobility, among those who would like to lead, to provide for the leadership needs of the schools. That this has allowed a certain amount of mediocrity to creep into the ranks of practicing administrators is evident ...[10]

Many writers contend that besides searching through the scholastic ranks in order to identify top-level students, teachers and administrators in the field need to be watchful for potential talent among their own colleagues and staff members. Other writers suggest that, for the most part, identifiers have overlooked the largest source of prospective administrators by clinging to the notion that women cannot be successful school administrators. "It requires little research effort to discover that women outnumber

---

[8] Ibid., p. 16.
[9] AASA Yearbook, 1960, op. cit., p. 145.
[10] Ibid.

men in the teaching ranks, and hence must, by sheer weight of numbers, include more outstanding individuals than does the male group."[11]

It would appear that getting responsible people, other than the superintendent, into the work of identification yields more reliable results. According to some experiments, staff members in the schools should be given an opportunity to identify those of their colleagues who appear to possess potentiality for educational leadership. Campbell[12] states that the most reliable criterion would be found in adequate behaviour of teachers in action, particularly as they work with their colleagues. Freeman and Taylor[13] suggested giving peer ratings a weight of fifty per cent of the total process, a self-rating an additional ten per cent and supervisors' ratings the balance.

The Southwest School Administration Center in Austin, Texas, singles out two types of criteria they employ in predicting over-all promise as school principals.[14] One is the pooled judgments of regular staff members of the University who have worked with the student in question for a period of ten to twelve weeks. The other criterion is the person's standing in the group with regard to responses to this request: "Name the three persons (in this group) whom you would most like to have as a principal over you." The

---

[11] Ibid., p. 147.

[12] Roald F. Campbell, "Research and the Selection and the Preparation of School Administrators," Educational Research Bulletin, 35:29, February, 1956.

[13] G.L. Freeman and E.K. Taylor, How to Pick Leaders (New York: Funk and Wagnalls Co., 1950), p. 9.

[14] McIntyre, op. cit., pp. 18, 19.

Southwest Center states that such peer ratings have been considered to be the best single index of leadership ability, in studies conducted in the military and elsewhere.[15] It was pointed out that these ratings by peers are made after more than two hundred hours of close association with the people who are being rated.

This thesis probes further into the problem of identifying potential principals by means of a simple technique referred to as nominations - using as nominators a peer group, and three superior groups: vice-principals, principals, and general supervisors.

## II. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

What are the characteristics of teachers whom peers and superiors identify for the principalship and to what degree do the various groups of nominators agree?

### General Procedure and Sub-Problems

1. Teachers identified as potential principals were divided into groups according to the source of their nomination: peers, vice-principals, principals, and supervisors. For each of these various groups data were collected to answer the following questions.

(a) What are the characteristics of the nominees according to age, years of training, years of teaching experience, years of system experience, and years of administrative experience.

---

[15] *Ibid.*, p. 19.

(b) Are there differences in characteristics of nominees for each of the various nominating groups?

2. Teachers identified as being unsuited for the principalship were divided into groups as explained in sub-problem one. For each of these groups data was secured to answer the questions posed above.

3. Are there significant differences in the characteristics of positive, negative, and neutral nominees?

4. (a) To what extent do the four groups of nominators agree upon who are potential principals? To what extent do they disagree?

(b) To what extent do the four groups of nominators agree upon who are unsuited for the principalship? To what extent do they disagree?

## III. DEFINITION OF TERMS

Positive Nomination. A nomination which indicated that the teacher was considered to be a potential principal.

Negative Nomination. A nomination which indicated that the teacher was considered to be unsuitable for the principalship.

Neutral Nomination. A nomination which was neither positive nor negative. This would occur if the subject was unknown to the nominator or if the nominator considered the subject to be neither a potential principal nor unsuited for the principalship.

Marital Status - Other. Any state of habitation other than married or single.

Years of Training. The number of years of training officially recognized by the employer for salary purposes.

## IV. LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

The scope of this study was confined to the non-administrative teaching staff of elementary-junior high schools in the public school system of Edmonton, Alberta. Only those schools having a total teacher-population of twenty or more were used.

This study does not attempt to determine whether those persons who were identified would or would not become effective principals, nor does this study consider any other identification technique other than simple nomination by peers and three superior groups: vice-principals, principals, and general supervisors.

## CHAPTER II

## A GENERAL SURVEY OF RELATED LITERATURE

Success in any endeavour depends largely upon the quality of its leadership. It follows therefore that selection of men with high leadership potential is a vital consideration.[1] Research into the process of leadership is aimed ultimately to provide better means of selecting principals and superintendents - to reduce the number of mistakes made by present methods.

> Sound educational administration lies at the heart of effective education. The school administrator must be able to deal with a host of problems - problems involving education policy, finance, material, personnel, community relationships - and he must deal with these problems in a manner to insure that every child who passes through this system will have the maximum opportunity to become personally mature, vocationally competent, and socially responsible.[2]

In an attempt to report more closely the information obtained in this general survey, this chapter has been sub-divided into the following divisions:

1. A critical look at conventional selection devices and procedures.

2. Modern identification and selection processes.

---

[1]J.H.M. Andrews, "Recent Research in Leadership," Canadian Education, 13: 15-24, September, 1958.

[2]"Development of Criteria of Success in School Administration," Agreement for Research Between the United States of America and Teachers' College, Columbia University (U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, 1957), Appendix A, p. 2.

# I. CONVENTIONAL SELECTION DEVICES AND PROCEDURES

## A CRITICAL EXAMINATION

In the early history of the principalship, the teacher considered to be the best disciplinarian, instructor, and the most physically able member of the staff, would often be appointed to the administrative post. Again, though not a common practice, an administrative assistant in the central office might be given the responsibility for a certain school. Yet one of the most important educational tasks was being neglected, namely that of providing adequate supervision of the instructional program. At this stage some supervisory leadership came largely from persons in the central administrative office, leaving the principals only the problems of discipline, clerical duties, and other executive matters, in addition to their own classroom teaching. Because this kind of administrative organization became entrenched, the professionalization of the principalship was slow in coming into its own, even with the demands for leadership evident in later years.[3]

As the modern concepts of the principalship and the superintendency evolved it became necessary for senior school officials to sharpen selection procedures. This essential move has not taken place as rapidly as many feel it should have. For example, Bowman and Savage[4] found that 65 per cent of the 654 superintendents

---

[3]Albert H. Shuster and Wilson F. Wetzler, Leadership in Elementary School Administration and Supervision (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1958), pp. 473-475.

[4]Thomas R. Bowman and William W. Savage, "Selecting the Superintendent," Administrator's Notebook, 4: 1-4, February, 1956.

participating in their study reported that "no specific procedures or standards of selection were set up" by the boards which had employed them.

When Campbell asked who shall be selected for the principalship he was considering practices frequently in use today:

> Shall we select for principals people who have been around a long time? Shall the principalship be a reward for faithful service? Shall we select a person for the principalship because he can discipline the big boys?[5]

He contended that most of the school system emphasized basic professional preparation and years of experience. Little emphasis was placed on continued professional development, and the research element, necessary to an overall school program, was almost entirely neglected except for an occasional thesis.

There are school systems, apparently, which accept the modern concept of the principalship, yet continue to employ selection criteria that had serious limitations even in past years. The literature points out a number of problems which are created when seniority, for example, is a principal factor in determining who will be promoted to the principalship. Campbell[6] suggests that when administrators are only teachers with a particular kind of seniority, the profession really suffers. Attaining an administrative assignment through simply waiting for it is taking a passive rather than an active role. Such passive behaviour is likely to be carried over into the administrative

---

[5]Roald F. Campbell and R.T. Gregg (eds.), Administrative Behaviour in Education (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1957), p. 404.

[6]Ibid., pp. 525-526.

position and the administrator is likely to behave as a defender of the present system rather than as its improver. A person entering administration by such a route is likely to do what the job has traditionally called for rather than to do what he should with the job. In such a sequence those for whom being an administrator is not a lifelong professional career, but rather a culminating goal, contribute little, if anything, to the development of the profession. Such a pattern of drawing individuals into administration is not unique; it requires only maturity and familiarity. Those called into administration through selective recruiting will face it differently from those who find administration left on their hands by the passing of the prior senior staff member.

Some superintendents claim to have an "eagle eye" when it comes to selecting principals. They confessed to an uncanny ability to assess personality and character through "tricky inanities that have no relationship to real leadership ability. Such practices have been and are as unscientific and as useless as is tire kicking in the purchase of an automobile."[7]

The four most common selection devices in use in many systems are: personal history blanks, letters of recommendation, interviews, and academic marks. Often a person seeking to be selected for a position in school administration is interviewed by one or more persons, and he is asked to submit certain personal history data, letters of recommendation from qualified persons, and a transcript

---

[7] Ibid.

of academic credits. "If he makes a fairly good impression in his interview, if he has selected his letters wisely, and if his academic marks are not hopelessly low, he stands a good chance of being employed in the position."[8]

Unfortunately courtesy, tact, adaptability, and other less tangible elements of personality and character cannot be accurately measured. For such traits rating devices and systematized judgments insure minimum error and maximum accuracy in evaluation. The special gift for sizing up people is, in reality, a crude method of rating, and the value of a rating scale in such a case may be questioned. However, it was pointed out in such instances that use of a rating scale would not destroy the ability to judge, and it might improve judgment.[9]

Nevertheless many of the traditional selection procedures and devices appear to be highly subjective, based on the assumptions that administration is not unique, and that it requires only maturity and familiarity. There was little evidence that leadership skills and attitudes were of any importance in determining who would be promoted.

## II. MODERN IDENTIFICATION AND SELECTION PROCESSES

There has been considerable emphasis recently on leadership development - particularly on a province-wide basis such as is found in Alberta. Local centres such as Etobicoke and South Peel Boards of

---

[8]Shuster and Wetzler, loc. cit.

[9]Glen U. Cleeton and Charles W. Mason, Executive Ability, (Yellow Spring, Ohio: Antioch Press, 1946), pp. 108-112.

Education have been pioneering in executive development programs, It has been all too apparent, however, that comparable progress has not been made in selection procedures for the principalship.[10]

Evaluation techniques. There appears to be much difficulty in developing testing devices that will accurately measure characteristics of leadership. Table I attempts to show the amenability to known testing devices of a generally accepted list of leadership characteristics. It is obvious that only a few of the less significant criteria were subject to valid measurement. The more fundamental traits were generally difficult and sometimes impossible to measure satisfactorily.

It appears that the addition of tests to selection procedures will not bring the efficiency of choice up to one hundred per cent.[11] Human nature does not permit the realization of such an ambitious hope. However, tests of reasonable validity will improve the effective average.

In the matter of rating scales several appear to be fairly valid - one of them being the situation action test advocated by Preuter.[12] Neagly suggested five types of tests that could be used in selecting educational leaders: interaction interviews, group interviews, psychodrama, the leadership sample, and the leaderless group situation.[13]

---

[10]Walter Worth, "New Directions in Principal Selections," The ATA Magazine, 39: 11-12, May, 1959.

[11]Cleeton and Mason, op. cit., p. 194.

[12]Worth, loc. cit.

[13]Ross L. Neagly, Recruitment and Selection of School Administrators, (New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1953), p. 10.

TABLE I

CHARACTERISTICS OF LEADERSHIP:
IN TERMS OF DEGREE OF AMENABILITY
TO KNOWN TESTING DEVICES*

| | Leadership Characteristics | Low 1 | 2 | Medium 3 | 4 | High 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | Specialized knowledge | | | | | x |
| 2. | Specialized abilities | | x | | | |
| 3. | Breadth of knowledge | | x | | | |
| 4. | Linguistic skills | | x | | | |
| 5. | Administration skills | | | x | | |
| 6. | Intelligence | | | | x | |
| 7. | Physique | | | | | x |
| 8. | Health and stamina | | | | x | |
| 9. | Age | | | | | x |
| 10. | Sex | | | | | x |
| 11. | Human Skills | | | x | | |
| 12. | Personality | | x | | | |
| 13. | Interests | | | x | | |
| 14. | Values | | x | | | |
| 15. | Attitudes | | x | | | |
| 16. | Concepts | | x | | | |

*Compiled from information in Roald F. Campbell and Russell T Gregg (eds.) Administrative Behaviour in Education, (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1957), p. 404.

Several investigators place certain types of rating scales at the top of the list of selection devices, particularly where subjectivity is reduced through multiple ratings. Extensive experimentation with "buddy ratings" in the military has resulted in the belief in some responsible quarters that such measures may be among the most valid indices of leadership. The combined ratings of superiors, peers, and subordinates seem to survive existing validity tests at least as well as any other known measure. Freeman and Taylor[14] suggest giving peer ratings a weight of 50 per cent of the total selection process, with self-rating given an additional 10 per cent. The use of ratings by peers and subordinates in selecting personnel is rare indeed, although some pioneering experimentation is being conducted at the University of Texas and elsewhere.[15]

Another rating device that holds promise is the force-choice rating, in which the human tendency to say the "nice" things about ratees is overcome by providing two equally attractive options, only one of which is relevant to educational leadership.[16]

Freeman and Taylor[17] proposed that the measure of leadership performance included the degrees of productivity attained by the unit led, and the morale and attitude of the individuals concerned.

> Leadership is not measured by the personal qualities which men in authority possess, nor found in the specific things they do to accomplish an end. It comes rather

---

[14]G.L. Freeman and E.K. Taylor, How to Pick Leaders, (New York: Funk and Wagnalls Co., 1950), p. 9 as cited in Campbell and Gregg, op. cit., pp. 414-416.

[15]Kenneth E. McIntyre, Group Processes (Austin, Texas: Southwestern Cooperative Program in Educational Administration, University of Texas, 1955), as cited in Campbell and Gregg, loc. cit.

[16]Campbell and Gregg, op. cit., p. 407.

[17]Freeman and Taylor, loc. cit.

> from the study of what effects their personality and behaviour have upon the group activities they lead. In the final analysis, leadership is measured by the led.[18]

Selection procedures. Florida State University School of Education in co-operation with a local school system reported on a new program of selection:

1. Miller Analogies Test for all applicants.
2. Essay test on general cultural and educational background for all applicants.
3. Interview of each applicant by a committee representing board, superintendent, superintendent's staff, principals, teachers, and University personnel.
4. Individual interviews by specialists from the University of Florida.
5. Final selection on the basis of test scores and ratings on the tests and interviews.[19]

Preuter[20] has experimented with a program which gave opportunities to work with potential leaders. The candidates were provided with opportunities for that potential to be developed so it may contribute to the good of the system. Leadership needs are many and not limited to the role of the vice-principal or the principal. The young leader's future is related, however, to his ability to prove that he is, or can be, a truly successful teacher. The minimum requirements for admission was a university degree. There was opportunity for much on-the-job experience, however this process can become successful to the degree it is planned. The vice-principalship, a necessity for efficient functioning of an urban school, was considered

---

[18] Ibid., p. 43.

[19] T.A. Brodie and N.C. Kearny, "Promotions Need Not Be A Problem," The School Executive, 77: 83-84, May, 1958.

[20] K.F. Preuter, "Executive Development Within a School System," Canadian Education, 12: 30-39, March, 1957.

training ground for further responsibilities.[21]

Shuster and Wetzler[22] suggested procedures for selection and appointment to the principalship.

1. That a specific selection plan based on certain personal and professional requirements be devised and adopted for use with all individuals seeking appointment to the principalship.
2. That qualifications be clearly defined and formulated by the chief administrative officer of the local school system in co-operation with professional principals' associations, particularly local ones.
3. That the school system have a written job analysis of the principalship to be used as a guide in arriving at stated qualifications and hiring procedures.
4. That standards require at least three years of successful elementary school experience including classroom teaching and certain leadership experiences, and that professional preparation will not be less than a master's degree, based on certain areas of course work.
5. That a careful analysis of the candidate's complete experience and professional records will be made by an administrative screening committee.
6. That planned interviews by the administrative committee be headed by the superintendent.
7. Some probationary plan of appointment be organized, together with an adequate orientation or induction program.[23]

Teachers College, Columbia University,[24] in a research project, developed test situations which represented the various aspects of the administrator's job. Materials that embody the various problem areas encountered by a principal, were prepared by people closely associated with school administration and were able to draw upon their own experience. These materials included such things as a

---

[21] Ibid.
[22] Shuster and Wetzler, loc. cit.
[23] Ibid.
[24] Agreement for Research, op. cit., p. 4.

letter of application for a teaching job, a report of a teachers' committee on curriculum revision, complaints from parents or Home and School officers, a request from a teacher for advice on handling a discipline problem, letters prepared for the principal's signature by a subordinate, a request for use of the school auditorium by a questionable organization, and the like. Various media were used in presenting these problems, possibly including tapes, role-playing, or sound movies as well as printed or written materials. As background a body of information about the school and the community was prepared. Candidates became almost as familiar with the hypothetical situation as with their own school system.[25]

Brodie and Kearny[26] have indicated that there are very definite procedures to follow in selecting new principals:

1. Adequate publicity to all promotion openings well in advance - with a closing date.
2. Explain the application procedure in all announcements.
3. Decisive factors should be explicitly delineated including personal characteristics and technical qualifications.
4. Evaluation factors, other than those specifically stated, should NOT be used.
5. Give careful consideration to all - with no final decisions before the deadline date.
6. Executive policy regarding relationships of factors such as age, professional seniority, and minimum in-service experience to promotional eligibility should be made a matter of public record.[27]

Russia takes its best teachers and makes them directors, believing that administrators need no training. Teachers are

---

[25] Ibid.

[26] Brodie and Kearny, loc. cit.

[27] Ibid.

picked because of demonstrated superior ability; length of service is also a factor (a prospective administrator must have taught for at least five years.)[28]

## III. SUMMARY

It would appear that promising candidates should be recognized early: found in the first five to ten years of teaching rather than later. Findings also support the wisdom of giving consideration to both men and women.[29] To the extent that certain personal qualities and behaviours are found to have relevance for effective administration, these qualities and behaviours are probably more reliably found through observation of candidates as teachers than through giving paper-and-pencil tests. There is again an implication that there must be a much closer affiliation of the campus and the field in selection processes. "The most reliable selection criterion would appear to be found in adequate behaviour of teachers in action, particularly as they work with colleagues."[30]

Little has been written about the use of combined ratings as a technique for identifying teachers for the principalship. It would appear that this area needs more exploration.

---

[28]Herbert Rudman, "Preparing Soviet School Officials," Michigan Education Journal, 36: 394-395, April, 1959.

[29]Roald F. Campbell, "Research and the Selection and the Preparation of School Administrators," Educational Research Bulletin, 35: 29-33, February, 1956.

[30]Ibid.

# CHAPTER III

## RESEARCH PROCEDURES

### I. DESIGN OF THE STUDY

The study involved four hundred four teachers in seventeen elementary-junior high schools, in a large urban school system, together with the vice-principals and principals of these schools, and three general supervisors of instruction. Thus four groups of persons were involved in identifying potential principals: teachers, vice-principals, principals, and supervisors. Each group completed a simple nomination form. The teacher-group of a particular school nominated persons from a list of the members of that staff as did the vice-principal and the principal of that school. The three supervisors completed nomination forms for each of the schools involved in the study.

In addition to completing nomination forms, three of the groups (teachers, vice-principals, and principals) completed a biographical questionnaire. Through the use of a code it was possible to match the biographical information with particular nominees.

Each nominator was asked to consider all persons on a given staff who were present for the group interview. Teacher-nominators were asked to disregard themselves as possible choices. The derived nomination of a given teacher could take any one of three forms: positive (which would indicate that the subject was considered to be potentially a very good principal), negative (which would indicate that the subject was considered unsuited for the principalship), or

neutral (which would indicate that the subject was neither suited nor unsuited or that the nominator was unable for various reasons to make a judgment).

A teacher was considered to have received a positive nomination from the staff when the net total of his positive nominations was equal to or greater than one-third the teacher population of the particular school. The net total was determined by subtracting the total negative nominations from the total positive nominations. To determine negative nominees the procedure was reversed. Table II shows examples of these procedures, which were arrived at arbitrarily.

Contradiction among nominators was evidenced when nominees received both positive and negative nominations. So that this contradiction might be reflected, the policy of reducing the larger of the two sums by subtracting the number of opposite-type nominations received was adopted. To determine which net scores would be considered significant, the formula $\frac{N}{3}$ was arrived at after examining the results from four randomly selected schools. It was felt that this formula would adequately discriminate among the types of nominees for investigation in the study.

The problem of determining various classes of nominees from the three other nominating groups presented no difficulty in as much as each subject would receive only one type of nomination per teacher from each of the three groups.

TABLE II

METHOD USED TO DETERMINE STAFF NOMINEES

| Teacher | Positive Nominations | Negative Nominations | Net Total | Derived Nomination |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| A | 𝍸 / | // | 4 + | o |
| B | 𝍸 𝍸 𝍸 // | /// | 14 + | + |
| C | 𝍸 𝍸 | 𝍸 𝍸 // | 2- | o |
| D | / | 𝍸 𝍸 //// | 13- | - |
| E | 𝍸 𝍸 | 𝍸 𝍸 | 0 | o |
| . | | | | |
| . | | | | |
| . | | | | |
| . | | | | |

N = 24 Significant figure: $\frac{N}{3} = 8$

Legend: + Positive nomination
- Negative nomination
o Neutral nomination

In the case of the three supervisors each nominated teachers who were under his or her jurisdiction. That is, the supervisor of division one education considered those teachers who taught in grades one, two, and three, the division two supervisor considered teachers in his division, and the division three supervisor restricted his nominations to the junior high school staff.

## II. INSTRUMENTATION

The instrumentation of the study depended upon the use of a specially constructed nomination form and a biographical data sheet. (See Appendix A)

Nominators were asked to disregard tradition or present regulations governing appointments. Such factors as age, long service, sex, and training need not necessarily have been considerations that would have affected their decisions. They were asked to regard only those factors, however tangible or intangible, that they felt to be important.

In deciding who on a given staff show high potential, nominators were asked to consider those members who would make "very good principals of a school such as this one, after a period of appropriate training or experience." In deciding who on a staff were unsuited for the principalship, nominators were advised to identify persons who, even though they might possess or obtain appropriate training and experience, do not, in the opinion of the nominator, possess characteristics required to become effective principals.

Nominators were asked to indicate in column three those persons who could not be categorized in either of the other two columns. The recording of all nominations was handled by each respondent using a staff directory pre-coded by the principal. While all nomination forms were identical in content, four different colours were used to distinguish among the groups of nominators.

In each case the schools and the teachers were identified by a code number. On a preliminary visit to each school the principal was provided with a master stencil on which was the staff directory. Provision was made for the principal to assign an identification number to each name on the list. This was to be done on the day of the scheduled visit so that persons absent on that particular day would not become potential nominees. This precaution was taken in order that absentees, for whom there would be no biographical data, would be ineligible for nomination. At no time was this coded staff directory available to the researcher. One copy of the directory was given to each staff member and to the vice-principal by the principal at the group interview. After this meeting one copy was mailed by the principal to each of the three supervisors. Table III shows the participating schools identified by code and the number of teachers who formed part of the experimental group.

The biographical data sheet asked the respondent to identify himself in code and provide the following information: age, sex, marital status, years of training, years of teaching experience, and years of administrative experience. The subject was asked whether he wished to become a principal at some time in the future; if the response was "yes", he was asked to rate how effective he believed he would be as a principal.

TABLE III

| School | Total Teacher Population | Male Population |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | 22 | 5 |
| 2 | 25 | 8 |
| 3 | 22 | 7 |
| 4 | 22 | 10 |
| 5 | 24 | 9 |
| 6 | 26 | 14 |
| 7 | 31 | 9 |
| 8 | 25 | 10 |
| 9 | 27 | 8 |
| 10 | 24 | 6 |
| 11 | 22 | 6 |
| 12 | 20 | 6 |
| 13 | 24 | 10 |
| 14 | 23 | 8 |
| 15 | 22 | 8 |
| 16 | 25 | 12 |
| 17 | 20 | 9 |
| TOTAL | 404 | 145 |

N = 17

## III. COLLECTION OF DATA

The data for this study were collected during the months of May and June of 1960. Before proceeding with the collection of data, the proposed study was submitted to the executive secretary of the Alberta Teachers' Association who, in endorsing it, wrote an open letter asking for the cooperation of teachers and principals in carrying out the study. This letter is reproduced in Appendix B of this study. The proposal was similarly submitted to the superintendent of the school system in which the study was to be conducted. Permission to proceed was granted on the understanding that the principal and staff of the schools were to have the final decision as to whether or not the experiment was to be carried out in any one school. The letter from the director of personnel, on behalf of the superintendent, is reproduced in Appendix C.

A teacher sample of four hundred four was obtained. In addition, seventeen vice-principals, seventeen principals, and three general supervisors participated as nominators.

## IV. THE NOMINATORS

In all cases the nomination forms and biographical data sheets were completed at a meeting of each school staff. A large enough room was selected so that nominations would be confidential. The researcher outlined the background of the study and carefully explained the procedure to be followed. The anonymity of the responses was assured. The forms were collected by the researcher

when the respondents had signified completion of the assignment. The principal collected the staff directories and he, himself, disposed of them.

At no time did any of the participants express an unwillingness to engage in the study. Rather, they were interested, cooperative, and very generous of their time in fulfilling their part in the project.

## V. THE PILOT STUDY

A pilot study was conducted in one school similar in size and organization to those in the sample. The purposes of the pilot study were to obtain practice in the research techniques to be used, to seek desirable refinements in the procedures to be followed, and to learn of problems that might arise in the study proper.

The major refinements made as a result of this study concerned the explanation session prior to the actual nomination period.

## VI. REPORTING OF RESULTS

The reporting of the findings of the investigation will be presented in the next three chapters of the thesis. These chapters correspond to the major areas investigated in the study. Chapter IV describes the total sample of teachers, vice-principals, and principals. Chapter V compares certain characteristics of nominees according to the source of nomination, while Chapter VI compares characteristics among positive nominees, negative nominees and other teachers. Extent of agreement among nominating groups is described

in the last chapter (VII). Also the last chapter reviews the findings and concludes by drawing implications for the important task of identifying potential school leaders, particularly the principal.

# CHAPTER IV

## CHARACTERISTICS OF TEACHERS, VICE-PRINCIPALS AND PRINCIPALS IN THE SAMPLE

Each nominator completed a biographical questionnaire which provided the following information:

1. age
2. sex
3. marital status
4. years of training
5. total years of teaching experience
6. years of teaching experience in the present school system
7. years of administrative experience outside the present school system
8. aspirations for advancement to the principalship
9. an evaluation of self in terms of potential effectiveness as a principal.

In order to interpret the findings with respect to the nominees, this chapter will report and examine specific characteristics for the total sample of teachers, vice-principals, and principals. Supervisors of instruction were not required to complete the biographical questionnaire. Because there were only three in this category it was felt that this data would reveal the identity of the respondents. Of the three supervisors, two were male and one was female.

Table IV summarizes the data received from teachers, vice-principals, and principals regarding sex and age. Of the 404 teachers,

TABLE IV

SEX AND AGE OF SAMPLE

| AGE | Teachers | | Vice-Principals | | Principals | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female |
| 55 and over | 8 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 |
| 50-54 | 15 | 33 | 3 | 0 | 8 | 0 |
| 45-59 | 17 | 37 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| 40-44 | 13 | 23 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 35-39 | 21 | 26 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 30-34 | 32 | 21 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 25-29 | 26 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 20-24 | 13 | 60 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| under 20 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| TOTAL | 145 | 259 | 17 | 0 | 17 | 0 |
| MEAN | 37.03 | 37.75 | 41.71 | 0 | 52.59 | 0 |

145 were males and 259 were females. All the vice-principals and principals were males. Of the total teacher sample 35.9 per cent were men while 64.1 per cent were women.

The male teachers ranged in age from 20 to over 55 years, while the females ranged in age from under 20 to over 55 years. The mean age for females was 37.75 years and the mean for males was 37.03.

The vice-principals ranged in age from 30 to 54 years and the principals ranged from 40 to over 55 years of age. The mean age for vice-principals was 41.71 while the mean for principals was 52.59 years.

Table V indicates that 18.80 per cent of the male teachers are single compared to 32.40 per cent of the female teachers. Except for one principal, all vice-principals and principals are married.

TABLE V

MARITAL STATUS OF SAMPLE

| | Teachers | | Vice-Principals | Principals |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Male | Female | | |
| SINGLE Number | 27 | 84 | 0 | 0 |
| SINGLE Per Cent | 18.80 | 32.40 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| MARRIED Number | 115 | 152 | 17 | 16 |
| MARRIED Per Cent | 79.13 | 58.70 | 100.00 | 94.20 |
| OTHER Number | 3 | 23 | 0 | 1 |
| OTHER Per Cent | 2.07 | 8.90 | 0.00 | 5.80 |

Of the female teachers, 8.90 per cent and of the male teachers 2.07 per cent class themselves as neither single nor married. Thus, 79.13 per cent of the male teachers and 58.70 per cent of the female teachers are married.

An analysis of years of training revealed that 70.50 per cent of the male teachers had the equivalent of the Bachelor of Education degree or higher compared to 27.00 per cent of the female teachers. Male teachers possessed an average of 4.40 years of training which was 1.60 years more than female teachers. The vice-principal group had 5.68 years of training while the principal group possessed 5.44 years of training. Table VI reveals the data on years of training.

TABLE VI

YEARS OF TRAINING OF SAMPLE

| YEARS | Teachers | | Vice-Principals | Principals |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Male | Female | | |
| 6 | 20 | 11 | 6 | 8 |
| 5 | 31 | 15 | 8 | 4 |
| 4 | 51 | 44 | 3 | 3 |
| 3 | 17 | 22 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | 10 | 45 | 0 | 2 |
| 1 | 16 | 122 | 0 | 0 |
| MEAN | 4.40 | 2.80 | 5.68 | 5.44 |

TABLE VII

YEARS OF TEACHING EXPERIENCE OF SAMPLE

| YEARS | Teachers Male | Teachers Female | Vice-Principals | Principals |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 29 or more | 6 | 23 | 2 | 14 |
| 22-28 | 18 | 18 | 2 | 3 |
| 16-21 | 10 | 29 | 2 | 0 |
| 11-15 | 34 | 52 | 7 | 0 |
| 7-10 | 21 | 38 | 4 | 0 |
| 4-6 | 24 | 36 | 0 | 0 |
| 2-3 | 17 | 32 | 0 | 0 |
| 1 | 15 | 31 | 0 | 0 |
| MEAN | 11.38 | 11.96 | 16.60 | 28.82 |

Female teachers had an average of .58 years more teaching experience than did the male teachers who had 11.38 years of teaching experience. Principals had 28.82 years of experience which was 12.22 more years than vice-principals. The range of teaching experience for teachers, both male and female was from one year to 29 or more years. The range for vice-principals was from 7 to 29 or more years while the range for principals was from 22 to 29 or more years. (See Table VII).

TABLE VIII

YEARS OF TEACHING EXPERIENCE IN THE SYSTEM

| YEARS | Teachers Male | Teachers Female | Vice-Principals | Principals |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 29 or more | 1 | 12 | 0 | 7 |
| 22-28 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 2 |
| 16-21 | 2 | 8 | 1 | 8 |
| 11-15 | 4 | 10 | 3 | 0 |
| 7-10 | 31 | 27 | 13 | 0 |
| 4-6 | 36 | 53 | 0 | 0 |
| 2-3 | 38 | 76 | 0 | 0 |
| 1 | 33 | 68 | 0 | 0 |
| MEAN | 4.78 | 6.05 | 9.88 | 26.42 |

One of the factors which often receives consideration in selecting teachers for administrative posts is years of teaching experience in the particular school system. Table VIII summarizes data relating to years of teaching experience in the school system. A comparison of this table with Table VII indicates that many teachers have had experience outside the system in which the study was conducted.

Male teachers had an average of 4.78 years of teaching experience in the system to which they were then attached compared to an average for female teachers of 6.05. Both averages indicate that each group

had more than five years of teaching experience outside the system in which the study was conducted. This situation is true for vice-principals who had an average of 9.88 years of experience in the system compared to a total teaching experience of 16.60 years. Principals indicated that they had an average of 26.42 years of experience in the system compared to a total of 28.82 years of experience.

Another factor which often has a bearing on promotions is previous administrative experience. Since a number of teachers have had 5 or more years of teaching experience outside the system, it is possible that many would have had administrative responsibilities in other school systems. Table IX summarizes data regarding this matter.

TABLE IX

YEARS OF ADMINISTRATIVE EXPERIENCE

| YEARS | Teachers Male | Teachers Female | Vice-Principals | Principals |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 16 or more | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| 11-15 | 9 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 7-10 | 9 | 4 | 1 | 2 |
| 4-6 | 11 | 10 | 0 | 2 |
| 2-3 | 22 | 8 | 5 | 4 |
| 1 | 13 | 6 | 1 | 1 |
| 0 | 78 | 225 | 8 | 7 |
| MEAN | 2.59 | 0.81 | 2.83 | 3.00 |

Male teachers had an average of 2.59 years of administrative experience compared with 0.81 years for female teachers. Both vice-principals and principals had more years of administrative experience outside the system than either of the teacher groups. Principals reported having an average of 3.00 years while vice-principals had 2.83 years.

Teachers were asked to indicate whether they wished to become a principal at some time in the future, irrespective of present practice and regulations governing appointments. Table X summarizes the aspirations of both male and female teachers.

TABLE X

ASPIRATIONS OF TEACHERS IN THE SAMPLE

| | | MALE TEACHERS | | FEMALE TEACHERS | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | NUMBER | PER CENT | NUMBER | PERCENT |
| Do you wish to become a principal at same time in the future? | YES | 77 | 53.10 | 14 | 5.40 |
| | UNDECIDED | 44 | 30.30 | 43 | 16.60 |
| | NO | 24 | 16.60 | 202 | 78.00 |

Of the male teachers 53.1 per cent indicated that they wished to become a principal at some time in the future and 30.30 per cent were undecided. Of the female teachers, 5.40 per cent indicated yes to the question, while 16.60 per cent were undecided. A total of 178 teachers either responded yes or undecided to the question. This figure appears high when it is compared with the number of advancement opportunities available in an average year in this particular school system. The

yearly average over the last five-year period is 10 opportunities for over 1500 teachers.

Teachers who responded yes or undecided were asked to complete a six-point self-rating question. They were asked to rate themselves on the scale to describe how effective they believed they would be as principals. Table XI records the responses made.

TABLE XI

SELF-RATING ON POTENTIAL EFFECTIVENESS AS PRINCIPAL

| | MALE TEACHERS | | FEMALE TEACHERS | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | NUMBER | PER CENT | NUMBER | PER CENT |
| Outstanding | 3 | 2.46 | 1 | 1.76 |
| Very Effective | 24 | 19.63 | 3 | 5.27 |
| Better Than Most | 23 | 18.82 | 7 | 12.24 |
| As Effective As Most | 70 | 58.27 | 44 | 77.21 |
| Less Effective Than Most | 1 | 0.82 | 2 | 3.52 |
| Unsuited | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 |

Of the male teachers 40.91 per cent indicated that they believed that they would be more effective than most principals while 19.27 per cent of the female teachers shared the same opinion. Of the males 58.27 per cent and 77.21 per cent of the females expressed the belief that they would be as effective as most principals.

In summary, this chapter has presented data gathered from the total teacher population, and data from the vice-principals and

principals, who, together with the teachers, acted as nominators. Chapter V will present the data gathered about the nominees. Comparisons will be made of certain characteristics according to source of information.

CHAPTER V

# COMPARISON OF CERTAIN CHARACTERISTICS OF POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE NOMINEES ACCORDING TO SOURCE OF NOMINATION

This chapter compares certain characteristics of nominees according to the source of nomination. The specific characteristics to be examined are: age, years of training, years of teaching experience, years of teaching experience in the system, and years of administrative experience. The discussion will be in two parts: positive nominees, negative nominees. The four sources of nomination were: peer, vice-principal, principal, supervisor.

## A. Positive Nominees

1. Age. The mean age of the four groups of nominees ranged from 37.48 to 38.46. When tested for significance, the differences noted were not significant at the .05 level.* Table XII displays the relevant data.

TABLE XII

AGE OF POSITIVE NOMINEES

| AGE | SOURCE OF NOMINATION | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Peer | Vice-Principal | Principal | Supervisor |
| 40 + | 26 | 38 | 44 | 42 |
| 30-39 | 25 | 23 | 29 | 30 |
| under 20-29 | 11 | 19 | 20 | 18 |
| MEAN | 37.48 | 38.46 | 38.19 | 38.44 |

Sample Mean = 37.61

*The Chi Square Test was used throughout this and the following chapter. The .05 level was considered minimal for significance.

Although there were significant differences in the ages of the nominators, these differences were not reflected in the ages of the persons they nominated. It should be pointed out that the mean age of the nominees was not significantly different from the mean age of all the teachers in the sample, which was 37.61 years.

2. Training.

TABLE XIII

PROFESSIONAL TRAINING OF POSITIVE NOMINEES

| Years of Training | SOURCE OF NOMINATION | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Peer | Vice-Principal | Principal | Supervisor |
| 4-6 | 48 | 45 | 53 | 49 |
| 1-3 | 14 | 35 | 40 | 41 |
| MEAN | 4.50 | 3.76 | 5.09 | 3.74 |

Sample Mean = 3.38

It is difficult to make accurate generalizations about the amount of training various groups of nominators would consider adequate for the principalship from this study. All nominators were asked to disregard requirements usually demanded. Rather, they were asked to nominate those persons who, after a period of appropriate training and/or experience would make effective principals. Thus, the nominators were to consider qualities of the person rather than paper qualifications.

Table XIII indicates that the mean years of training for the

whole sample was 3.38. This differed significantly from the training of each of the nominee-groups. In every case the nominees had more training than did the teachers in the sample.

The differences noted among the four groups of nominees are also significant. These differences range from a mean of 3.74 to 5.09 years. Although the supervisors and vice-principals had more training than did the other two nominator groups, both supervisors and vice-principals identified teachers who possessed less training than did other nominees.

It is possible that supervisors and vice-principals were making decisions on the premise that their nominees would undertake additional training. To these nominators the question of training may have been secondary to the question of promise or potential as an effective principal. It is further possible that principals and teachers were more concerned with the professional preparation of their nominees. It is not difficult to see why the peer group would be concerned with this aspect since a large percentage of teachers are currently engaged in raising their professional qualifications.

3. Years of Teaching Experience.

TABLE XIV

TEACHING EXPERIENCE OF POSITIVE NOMINEES

| YEARS | SOURCE OF NOMINATION | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Peer | Vice-Principal | Principal | Supervisor |
| 16 + | 16 | 24 | 27 | 30 |
| 11-15 | 20 | 25 | 28 | 23 |
| 1-10 | 26 | 31 | 38 | 37 |
| MEAN | 12.79 | 13.59 | 13.31 | 13.88 |

Sample Mean = 11.70

The number of years of teaching experience has long been an important factor in criteria for promotion. While the mean experience of the sample was 11.70 years, significantly less than the experience of the nominees, it would be unjustified to assert that amount of experience was an important factor in identification. It could be argued that teachers, with many years of experience, would be better known by their colleagues and hence more visible to the selectors. Nevertheless nominees do have more teaching experience than did the sample of which they formed a small part.

The differences noted among the four nominee groups, ranging from 12.79 to 13.88 years, are not significant - although there are significant differences in the amount of experience of the nominators.

Table XIV contains the information compiled relating to total teaching experience.

4. Years of System Experience.

TABLE XV

SYSTEM TEACHING EXPERIENCE OF POSITIVE NOMINEES

| YEARS | SOURCE OF NOMINATION | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Peer | Vice-Principal | Principal | Supervisor |
| 7 + | 24 | 29 | 33 | 41 |
| 4-6 | 20 | 22 | 30 | 26 |
| 1-3 | 18 | 29 | 30 | 23 |
| MEAN | 6.00 | 6.19 | 6.07 | 7.33 |

Sample Mean = 5.65

Another factor that has been given considerable weight in many school systems when determining who shall be promoted is length of service in the particular school system. It appears that the nominators did choose persons having more system experience than possessed by the sample. The mean for the sample, 5.65 years, was significantly less than that of the nominees.

An examination of the system experience in Table XV indicates no significant differences among the means for three of the nominee groups: peer, vice-principal, and principal. However, the supervisor nominees had significantly more system experience than did other

nominees. This might be explained by the fact that supervisors are not always able to get acquainted with newer members of a large system as readily as nominators who are resident in a school. It is often difficult for central office personnel to identify relatively new members in a school system for purposes of promotion.

5. Years of Administrative Experience.

TABLE XVI

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPERIENCE OF POSITIVE NOMINEES

| YEARS | SOURCE OF NOMINATION | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Peer | Vice-Principal | Principal | Supervisor |
| 4 + | 13 | 14 | 19 | 17 |
| 1-3 | 19 | 20 | 22 | 17 |
| 0 | 30 | 46 | 52 | 56 |
| MEAN | 2.57 | 2.11 | 2.42 | 2.12 |

Sample Mean = 1.45

Table XVI reveals the administrative experience of the nominees. Frequently administrative experience is a factor in determining eligibility for promotion. Nominees had significantly more administrative experience than did the sample. The mean for the sample was 1.45 years. Although nominees did, in fact, have more administrative experience, this cannot be interpreted to mean that they were identified because of this factor. It is quite possible that because these persons had

those qualities essential to leadership roles they were chosen for administrative positions in systems prior to joining the present system. Thus their identification in this study might be attributable to their ability rather than the experience factor.

When differences in amount of administrative experience among nominee-groups were examined, the differences were not significant. Any differences noted could be attributed to chance factors.

## SUMMARY

When compared with the whole sample positive nominees were similar in age. Yet, on characteristics such as professional training, total teaching experience, system experience, and administrative experience, positive nominees exceeded the averages of the sample. It would be unwise to conclude that these factors, in themselves, were significant in the identification of these teachers. It must be remembered that nominators were asked to disregard traditional criteria often employed. Rather, the nominators could identify persons who gave evidence of potential - who would at some future time, following appropriate preparation, become an effective principal. Nevertheless, the nominees did possess more training and experience. Both of these factors, though, could have contributed to the potential effectiveness of the individuals concerned. It must not be overlooked that persons possessing greater amounts of these more concrete qualifications are often more visible to their colleagues simply because they have become better known. Nor can the possibility be overlooked that the nominees did in fact possess qualities not determined or measured in

this study and that it was the presence of these qualities that heightened their visibility to their nominators.

With respect to age, total teaching experience, and administrative experience as between different sources of nomination, there was no relationship between a particular category and the specific characteristic of the person nominated. These were two independent variables. However, with respect to professional training, vice-principal and supervisor nominees possessed significantly less training than did peer and principal nominees. This might be explained in a variety of ways. One possible explanation is that vice-principals and supervisors nominated a higher percentage of women than did peers and principals. (Vice-principal nominees and supervisor nominees consisted of 37 and 52 per cent women respectively, while peers and principals were 18 and 31 per cent respectively.) In the sample females had a mean of 2.80 years compared with the male mean of 4.40 years.

No significant differences in system experience were noted among three of the nominee groups. But supervisor-nominees had significantly more experience than did the other nominees. It is reasonable to assume that central office supervisors would be more familiar with the potential of teachers who had been in the system for some time than with relatively recent appointees.

B. Negative Nominees

1. Age. Table XVII displays information relating to the age

of negative nominees. In comparing the ages of these nominees with the ages of teachers in the sample, the differences were not significant. Thus, in terms of age, negative nominees were not unlike the sample.

TABLE XVII

AGE OF NEGATIVE NOMINEES

| AGE | SOURCE OF NOMINATION | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Peer | Vice-Principal | Principal | Supervisor |
| 45 + | 19 | 51 | 43 | 39 |
| 30-44 | 15 | 47 | 36 | 23 |
| under 20-29 | 20 | 41 | 36 | 22 |
| MEAN | 37.50 | 38.64 | 39.03 | 40.98 |

Sample Mean = 37.61

Though the mean age of the four groups of nominees ranged from 37.50 to 40.98 years, the differences are not statistically significant. It follows then that there is no relationship between the category and the age of the person nominated. These are two independent variables.

2. Years of Training.

TABLE XVIII

PROFESSIONAL TRAINING OF NEGATIVE NOMINEES

| Years of Training | SOURCE OF NOMINATION | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Peer | Vice-Principal | Principal | Supervisor |
| 4 - 6 | 16 | 48 | 45 | 41 |
| 1 - 3 | 38 | 91 | 70 | 43 |
| MEAN | 2.96 | 3.15 | 3.30 | 3.60 |

Sample Mean = 3.38

Compared with the whole sample, negative nominees had similar amounts of training. Also, when comparing training among the nominee-groups, Table XVIII reveals that with the exception of supervisor nominees the differences noted are not significant. Even with a range from 2.96 to 3.30 years, it can be stated that the amount of professional training of three of the nominee groups was not dependent upon the category of the nominator. Supervisor nominees tended to possess more training than did other nominees.

3. Years of Teaching Experience.

TABLE XIX

TEACHING EXPERIENCE OF NEGATIVE NOMINEES

| YEARS | SOURCE OF NOMINATION | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Peer | Vice-Principal | Principal | Supervisor |
| 16 + | 11 | 38 | 31 | 31 |
| 7-15 | 20 | 47 | 39 | 24 |
| 1-6 | 23 | 54 | 45 | 29 |
| MEAN | 11.24 | 11.63 | 11.82 | 13.84 |

Sample Mean = 11.70

While the mean experience of the total sample was 11.70 years, this figure is not significantly different from the mean experience of the nominees. Table XIX indicates the differences among the nominee-groups. Upon applying a significance test, it was noted that these differences are attributed to chance factors.

4. Years of System Experience.

TABLE XX

SYSTEM TEACHING EXPERIENCE OF NEGATIVE NOMINEES

| YEARS | SOURCE OF NOMINATION | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Peer | Vice-Principal | Principal | Supervisor |
| 4 + | 18 | 56 | 51 | 37 |
| 2-3 | 19 | 46 | 37 | 25 |
| 1 | 17 | 37 | 27 | 22 |
| MEAN | 5.47 | 5.41 | 6.14 | 6.16 |

Sample Mean = 5.65

The length of teaching experience of the nominees was similar to that of the whole sample. The differences were tested and found to be not significant.

Table XX displays data relative to system experience of the nominee-groups. Here, again, the differences noted were found to be not significant.

5. Years of Administrative Experience.

Table XXI reveals that the mean number of years of administrative experience for the nominee-groups ranges from 1.13 to 2.34 years. While the differences appear great, statistical tests show them to be not significant at the .05 level.

Further, the negative nominees have similar amounts of administrative experience as teachers in the total sample.

TABLE XXI

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPERIENCE OF NEGATIVE NOMINEES

| YEARS | SOURCE OF NOMINATION | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Peer | Vice-Principal | Principal | Supervisor |
| 4 + | 6 | 16 | 17 | 16 |
| 1-3 | 5 | 14 | 6 | 13 |
| 0 | 43 | 107 | 92 | 55 |
| MEAN | 1.13 | 2.34 | 1.47 | 1.80 |

Sample Mean = 1.45

## SUMMARY

When compared with the whole sample, negative nominees were similar in age, professional training, total teaching experience, system experience, and administrative experience. Negative nominees were not unlike their colleagues in at least these five respects.

When nominees of the four groups of nominators were studied, it was found that for all five characteristics the differences noted were not significant. Only with respect to training was it found that one nominee group (superior) had significantly more than others. In other words, in all cases but one there was found to be no relationship between the category and the particular characteristic of the person nominated.

# CHAPTER VI

## COMPARISON OF CHARACTERISTICS AMONG POSITIVE, NEGATIVE, AND NEUTRAL NOMINEES

In this chapter, a comparison is made of nine characteristics among positive, negative and neutral nominees. To do this it was necessary to determine criteria for placement of teachers in those three groups. For purposes of this particular investigation, any teacher receiving two or more positive nominations (irrespective of source) would be a positive nominee; any teacher receiving two or more negative nominations (irrespective of source) would be a negative nominee; and, teachers not in either of the two aforementioned categories would be classed as neutral nominees. It is of interest to note that, of the 404 teachers in the sample, there was no one who received both two positive and two negative nominations. The majority of the neutral nominees have one positive or one negative nomination and three neutral nominations. There were 181 teachers who received three or more neutral nominations; there were 23 teachers who received one positive, one negative, and two neutral nominations - making a total of 204 neutral nominees.

The characteristics of the three groups of teachers to be examined are: sex, age, marital status, years of training, total teaching experience, system experience, administrative experience, aspirations, and self-evaluation of probable administrative effectiveness. Significance of differences between and among the three groups will be tested. The .05 level will be considered significant.*

*As indicated in Chapter V, the Chi Square Test is used throughout this chapter.

1. Sex.

TABLE XXII

SEX OF NOMINEES

| SEX | CATEGORY OF NOMINEE Positive | Negative | Neutral |
|---|---|---|---|
| Male | 66 | 28 | 51 |
| Female | 27 | 79 | 153 |
| Total | 93 | 107 | 204 |

The variations in the ratio of males to females shown in Table XXII among the three groups were significant at the .05 level. The ratio differences between positive and negative nominees and between positive and neutral nominees were also significant. However, the ratio difference between negative and neutral nominees was not statistically significant. The chart which follows summarizes the degree of significance among the three groups which have been represented as follows: positive (+), negative (-), and neutral (o).

| | + | - | o |
|---|---|---|---|
| - | .05 | | |
| o | | N.S. | |
| + | | | .05 |

The initials N.S. are used to represent not significant.

It is possible to conclude from this information that males were more often identified for leadership roles than were females - the ratio being approximately 2:1. It follows, then, that positive nominees are more likely to be males.

2. Age.

TABLE XXIII

AGE OF NOMINEES

| AGE | CATEGORY OF NOMINEE Positive | Negative | Neutral |
|---|---|---|---|
| 45+ | 31 | 42 | 66 |
| 30-44 | 45 | 34 | 57 |
| under 20-29 | 17 | 31 | 81 |
| MEAN | 38.5 | 39.3 | 36.5 |

The differences among the mean ages of the nominee groups revealed in Table XXIII were significant at the .01 level. The mean age differences between neutral and negative nominees and between positive and neutral nominees were also statistically significant.

| | + | - | o |
|---|---|---|---|
| - | N.S. | | |
| o | | .05 | |
| + | | | .01 |

From this analysis it can be concluded that positive nominees

are not unlike in age from the negative nominees; further, that both positive and negative nominees are older than neutral nominees. It is possible that many of the younger teachers would have received neutral nominations because the nominator-groups would have not been sure of the younger teachers' potential.

3. Marital Status.

TABLE XXIV

MARITAL STATUS OF NOMINEES

| STATUS | CATEGORY OF NOMINEE | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Positive | Negative | Neutral |
| Single | 17 | 35 | 59 |
| Married | 74 | 64 | 129 |
| Other | 2 | 8 | 16 |
| % Married | 80% | 60% | 63% |

Table XXIV displays the data regarding the marital status of the nominees. The differences among the percentages of married teachers in the three groups were significant at the .05 level. The differences between the percentage married of positive and negative nominees and between positive and neutral nominees were statistically significant.

| | + | - | o |
|---|---|---|---|
| - | .01 | | |
| o | | N.S. | |
| + | | | .05 |

A greater percentage of positive nominees are married than are negative and neutral nominees. The ratios of married teachers in the negative and neutral categories are not statistically different. Thus, there is a definite tendency on the part of nominators to identify for leadership roles, personnel who are married.

4. Professional Teacher Training.

TABLE XXV

PROFESSIONAL TRAINING OF NOMINEES

| YEARS | CATEGORY OF NOMINEE Positive | Negative | Neutral |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1-3 | 33 | 68 | 131 |
| 4-6 | 60 | 39 | 73 |
| MEAN | 4.04 | 3.14 | 3.17 |

Tabulated in Table XXV is data pertaining to the number of years of training for which nominees are receiving credit for salary purposes. The differences among the mean years of training of nominee-groups were significant at the .01 level. The differences between the mean number of years of training of positive and negative nominees and between the means of positive and neutral nominees were significant at the .01 level.

| | + | - | o |
|---|---|---|---|
| - | .01 | | |
| o | | N.S. | |
| + | | | .01 |

Positive nominees possessed more training than did both negative and neutral nominees. The latter two groups possessed similar amounts both significantly less than that possessed by the positive group.

5. Total Teaching Experience.

TABLE XXVI

TOTAL TEACHING EXPERIENCE OF NOMINEES

| YEARS | CATEGORY OF NOMINEE | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Positive | Negative | Neutral |
| 1-6 | 21 | 41 | 93 |
| 7-15 | 42 | 34 | 69 |
| 16 + | 30 | 32 | 42 |
| MEAN | 14.1 | 12.2 | 10.4 |

Data revealing information concerning total teaching experience of nominees is recorded in Table XXVI. The differences among the means of the three nominee-groups were significant at the .01 level. The differences between the means of positive and negative nominees were significant at the .05 level while differences between the means of positive and neutral nominees were significant at the .01 level.

| | + | - | o |
|---|---|---|---|
| - | .05 | | |
| o | | N.S. | |
| + | | | .01 |

Positive nominees possess more teaching experience than either of the two remaining groups; negative and neutral nominees hold similar amounts of teaching experience.

6. System Experience.

TABLE XXVII

SYSTEM TEACHING EXPERIENCE OF NOMINEES

| YEARS | CATEGORY OF NOMINEE | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Positive | Negative | Neutral |
| 1-3 | 27 | 63 | 125 |
| 4-10 | 54 | 31 | 62 |
| 11 + | 12 | 13 | 17 |
| MEAN | 6.5 | 6.2 | 5.1 |

System experience of the nominees is recorded in Table XXVII. The differences among the means of the three categories of nominees are significant at the .01 level. Between groups the following differences were statistically significant: the difference in the means of positive and negative nominees, and the difference in the means of positive and neutral nominees.

| | + | - | o |
|---|---|---|---|
| - | .01 | | |
| o | | N.S. | |
| + | | | .01 |

From this evidence it can be concluded that positive nominees had more system experience than did the other two groups; there was no significant difference between the amounts of system experience of the negative and neutral nominees.

7. Administrative Experience.

TABLE XXVIII

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPERIENCE OF NOMINEES

| YEARS | CATEGORY OF NOMINEE | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Positive | Negative | Neutral |
| 0 | 50 | 85 | 168 |
| 1-6 | 29 | 16 | 28 |
| 7 + | 14 | 6 | 11 |
| MEAN | 2.5 | 1.4 | 1.0 |

Table XXVIII contains data which reveals the number of years of administrative experience teachers in the sample obtained prior to joining the staff of the school system to which they belonged at the time of this study. The differences among the means of the three nominee-groups were found to be significant at the .01 level. The differences between the means of positive and negative nominees and between positive and neutral nominees were significant at the .01 level.

| | + | - | o |
|---|---|---|---|
| - | .01 | | |
| o | | N.S. | |
| + | | | .01 |

With regard to previous administrative experience, positive nominees possessed more than did the other two groups. It should be noted, however, that in excess of 60 per cent of the positive nominees had no administrative experience. Finally, there was no significant difference between the means of negative and neutral nominees.

8. Aspirations.

The responses made by the 404 teachers in this study to the question "Do you wish to become a principal at some time in the future?" are tabulated in Table XXIX.

TABLE XXIX

ASPIRATIONS OF NOMINEES

| "Do you wish to become a principal?" | CATEGORY OF NOMINEE | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Positive | Negative | Neutral |
| Yes | 43 | 12 | 36 |
| Undecided | 29 | 29 | 29 |
| No | 21 | 66 | 139 |
| % Yes | 46.3 | 11.2 | 17.6 |

The variations in the responses among the three nominee-groups were significant at the .01 level. The differences between groups were all significant.

| | + | - | o |
|---|---|---|---|
| - | .01 | | |
| o | | .05 | |
| + | | | .01 |

A higher proportion of positive nominees, compared with the other two groups, aspired to the principalship. Negative nominees were least interested in becoming principals of schools.

9. Self-Evaluation.

TABLE XXX

SELF EVALUATION OF PROBABLE ADMINISTRATIVE EFFECTIVENESS OF NOMINEES

| "How effective would you be as a principal?" | CATEGORY OF NOMINEE | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| RATING | Positive | Negative | Neutral |
| More Effective Than Most | 26 | 12 | 23 |
| As Effective As Most | 46 | 29 | 42 |
| % high self-evaluation | 36.1 | 29.3 | 35.4 |

Note: This information was obtained from those teachers who answered "Yes" or "Undecided" to the question, "Do you wish to become a principal at some time in the future?" Teachers answering "No" did not complete the self-evaluation.

Teachers who responded "Yes" or "Undecided" completed a six-point self-evaluation scale. (See Appendix A). Following a study of the

responses it was concluded that the differences which appeared were not statistically significant.

| | + | - | o |
|---|---|---|---|
| - | N.S. | | |
| o | | N.S. | |
| + | | | N.S. |

On the basis of this evidence, it appears that there is no relationship between a teacher's self-evaluation of his probable administrative effectiveness and his category (positive, negative, or neutral). However, it would be unwise to draw definite conclusions from this evidence; it may be that not all respondents would answer such a rating in an intellectually honest manner. Some would undoubtedly be governed by feelings of modesty, others may be overly optimistic in judging their own potential.

## SUMMARY

Certain characteristics of positive nominees emerge - characteristics that are different from either negative or neutral nominees. Males are identified more frequently than are females: the ratio was 2 to 1. The fact that any females were in the positive group, though, will be surprising to those systems which choose not to appoint women to the principalship. Four out of five nominees are married and in general possess more teacher training than do others. The amounts of total teaching, system

and administrative experience of positive nominees exceeded that possessed by negative and neutral nominees. Further, a greater percentage of positive nominees aspired to the principalship.

For two of the characteristics positive nominees were not unlike other groups. With respect to age, positive nominees were similar to negative nominees; both of these groups, though, tended to be older than neutral nominees. In regards to self-evaluation of probable administrative effectiveness, differences between and among the categories were not significant.

Negative nominees were similar to neutral nominees on a number of factors: sex ratio, marital status, training, total teaching experience, system and administrative experience, and self-evaluation. Only in matters related to age and aspirations were differences significant. As indicated in the previous paragraph, negative nominees were older than neutral nominees, but, with respect to aspirations, a lower percentage of negative nominees wish to become principals.

# CHAPTER VII

## EXTENT OF AGREEMENT AMONG NOMINATORS AND CONCLUSIONS

In this concluding chapter, the first section will deal with the extent of agreement among the four groups of nominators. The second section will isolate certain conclusions that can be made on the basis of evidence gathered and will set out various implications the study offers for the identification of potential principals.

### I. EXTENT OF AGREEMENT AMONG NOMINATORS

The extent to which the various groups of nominators agree with one another about positive and negative choices will be examined next. Complete agreement would result when the groups in question identify the same persons. In this study partial agreement would be indicated when one group identifies a person as either positive or negative and another group or other groups does not identify that person as either negative or positive. Contradiction would be indicated if one group identified a person as either positive or negative and another group or other groups would identify the person as either negative or positive respectively. The following analyses will be made: extent of agreement between

(1) staff and vice-principals

(2) staff and principals

(3) staff and supervisors

(4) vice-principals and principals

(5) vice-principals and supervisors, and

(6) principals and supervisors

A. Positive Nominees: Agreement and Contradiction.

It would appear that staff and principals were in closer agreement about choices of positive nominees than were other pairs of groups -- agreeing on 47.6 per cent of the cases. (See Table XXXI) Vice-principals and principals agreed on 46.9 per cent of the cases. This is not too surprising in that many vice-principals and principals would, in the course of their duties, share information concerning strengths and weaknesses of their staff. The pair of groups which appears to be next highest in terms of agreement was staff and vice-principals -- reaching agreement on 41.4 per cent. The least agreement was between staff and supervisors -- agreeing on 33.6 per cent of the cases. Vice-principals and supervisors together with principals and supervisors were next lowest -- from 1 to 3 per cent in closer agreement than were the staff and supervisors. Upon inspection it would appear that most agreement was reached over principal nominees, next for nominees of vice-principals, next staff nominees, and least agreement for supervisor nominees.

No test of significance was made because on the basis of probability category three would be as large in frequency as category one. These differences are so large in each case that it is apparent that chance factors cannot account for the differences.

TABLE XXXI

EXTENT OF AGREEMENT BETWEEN VARIOUS GROUPS OF NOMINATORS

(Key: 1 - agreement; 2 - partial agreement; 3 - contradiction)

| | POSITIVE NOMINEES CATEGORY | | | NEGATIVE NOMINEES CATEGORY | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| | Number of Cases | | | Number of Cases | | |
| Staff and Vice-Principals | 41 | 55 | 3 | 36 | 116 | 2 |
| Per Cent | 41.4 | 55.6 | 3.0 | 23.4 | 75.3 | 1.3 |
| Staff and Principals | 50 | 54 | 1 | 34 | 100 | 0 |
| Per Cent | 47.6 | 51.4 | 1.0 | 25.4 | 74.6 | 0.0 |
| Vice-Principals and Principals | 53 | 57 | 3 | 64 | 115 | 7 |
| Per Cent | 46.9 | 50.5 | 2.6 | 34.4 | 61.9 | 3.7 |
| Staff and Supervisors | 38 | 68 | 7 | 16 | 98 | 1 |
| Per Cent | 33.6 | 60.1 | 6.3 | 13.9 | 85.2 | 0.9 |
| Vice-Principals and Supervisors | 41 | 67 | 10 | 31 | 140 | 11 |
| Per Cent | 34.7 | 56.8 | 8.5 | 17.0 | 77.0 | 6.0 |
| Principals and Supervisors | 46 | 73 | 7 | 31 | 119 | 11 |
| Per Cent | 36.5 | 58.0 | 5.5 | 19.2 | 74.0 | 6.8 |

It will be remembered that contradiction in this study occurs when the positive nominee of one group was the negative nominee of other groups in question or vice-versa. The greatest amount of contradiction appears to exist between each of the three school groups and the supervisor group: the range being from 5.5 per cent (between principals and supervisors) to 8.5 per cent (between vice-principals and supervisors). Among the school groups the greatest amount of contradiction was between the staff and vice-principals.

Among the positive nominees those nominated by supervisors tended to be the most contradictory. The second most contradictory were vice-principal nominees, the third were staff nominees and the least contradictory were principal nominees.

B. Negative Nominees: Agreement and Contradiction.

Of the groups within the school it appears from Table XXXI that the vice-principals and principals were closest in agreement about who were unsuited for the principalship while staffs and principals were next closest in agreement. Staffs and vice-principals showed the least agreement. Comparing school groups with the supervisor group the principals and supervisors showed the closest agreement while vice-principals were next closest in agreement. Staffs and supervisors showed the least agreement.

Upon inspection it would seem that there was more agreement over the negative choices made by principals than choices by other groups. Further, it would appear that the second highest agreement

was for vice-principal nominees.

Contradiction over negative nominees by the groups within the school was greatest between vice-principals and principals; the greatest contradiction between school groups and the supervisor groups was between principals and supervisors -- some 6.8 per cent of the cases. The next greatest amount of contradiction was between vice-principals and supervisors.

Among the negative nominees those nominated by supervisors tended to be the most contradictory. The second most contradictory appeared to be vice-principal nominees and the least contradictory staff nominees.

Summary

TABLE XXXII

NOMINEE GROUPS APPEARING TO REFLECT EXTREMES OF AGREEMENT AND CONTRADICTION

| | AGREEMENT | | CONTRADICTION | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | MOST | LEAST | MOST | LEAST |
| Positive | Principal Nominees | Supervisor Nominees | Supervisor Nominees | Principal Nominees |
| Negative | Principal Nominees | Supervisor Nominees | Supervisor Nominees | Staff Nominees |

Table XXXII summarizes which nominee-groups appear to reflect extremes of agreement and contradiction.

The table suggests that supervisor nominees both positive and negative received the least amount of support from other nominating groups as well as being the most contradictory. Principal nominees, both positive and negative, received the most support from other groups and the principal positive nominees were the least contradictory. Negative nominees of staffs were less contradictory than were other negative nominees.

It would be difficult to present precise reasons why supervisor nominees should appear not only to receive less support but also to be more contradictory than other nominees. As indicated in an earlier chapter, it might be possible that the further removed nominators are from the area in which candidates are working day by day with colleagues and pupils the more these nominators must rely upon so called paper qualifications and the more they are likely to be influenced by negative type information. Such information, noted on personnel records, might include instances where the person in question failed to follow directives, openly questioned senior policy decisions or was critical of system procedures. Adverse remarks made by parents or principals may often come to the attention of supervisors.

Staffs were reticent to nominate colleagues as being unsuited for the principalship and tended, perhaps, to do so only in extreme cases. This observation may account for the small amount of contradiction over staff negative nominees. Principals appear to make choices, both positive and negative, which are closer to those of other groups. These men would likely be sensitive to staff reaction

to the individuals in question, know something of the strengths and weaknesses of staff members, and be aware of the responsibilities of the office. The principals may well be sensitive to the qualities and competencies looked for by senior school personnel. It would appear that principals might well be reliable members on the team which would help identify potential administrators.

## II. A REVIEW OF THE FINDINGS

This study sought answers to three major questions. These questions together with a brief statement of the relevant findings will be reviewed.

(1) What are the characteristics of the positive and negative nominees which were identified by the four nominator groups: teachers, vice-principals, principals, and supervisors? Are there differences in characteristics of nominees for each of the various nominating groups?

Age. The mean age of the positive nominees ranged from 37.48 to 38.44 years. These mean ages were not significantly different one from the other, nor were these ages different from the mean age of all the teachers in the sample. These findings were also true for negative nominees; while the mean age of the four groups of nominees ranged from 37.50 to 40.98 years, the differences were not statistically significant.

Training. Positive nominees had significantly more training than did teachers in the sample. The nominees' training ranged from

3.74 to 5.09 years compared with the sample's mean of 3.38 years. Further, supervisor and vice-principal nominees had significantly less training than did other nominees: supervisor nominees had 3.74 years while vice-principal nominees had 3.76 years as compared with teacher nominees - 4.50 years and principal nominees - 5.09 years. Compared with the total teacher sample, negative nominees had similar amounts of training. Comparing amounts of training among the groups of negative nominees, it was found that, with the exception of supervisor nominees, the differences noted were not significant. Supervisor nominees with a mean of 3.60 years possessed more training than did other negative nominees.

Teaching Experience. Positive nominees, with a range of experience from 12.79 to 13.88 years, had more experience than did the sample -- which had a mean of 11.70 years. No significant differences were noted among the mean experience of positive nominees. The mean experience of negative nominees was similar to that of the sample and the differences noted among the groups were not significant.

System Experience. Positive nominees had more system experience than did teachers in the sample. System experience of the nominees ranged from 6.00 years to 7.33 years while the mean for the sample was 5.65 years. Examining differences among the four groups, it was found that supervisor nominees had more system experience (7.33 years) than did other nominee groups. When compared with the sample negative nominees had similar amounts of

experience; the differences noted among the groups were not significant.

Administrative Experience. The mean experience of the sample (1.45 years) was less than the means of the four groups of positive nominees which ranged from 2.11 to 2.57 years. Negative nominees had similar amounts of system experience compared with the sample. Differences among the four groups of positive nominees as well as differences among the groups of negative nominees were not significant.

Thus, in general, few differences existed among positive nominee groups, while no differences were noted among negative nominee groups. Compared with the sample, positive nominees exceeded in all categories but age - here there was no significant difference. Negative nominees were not unlike the sample on all five characteristics studied.

(2) Are there differences among and between the three classes of nominees: positive, negative, and neutral?

Positive nominees (persons receiving positive nominations from two or more sources) exceeded other classes of nominees in total teaching, system, and administrative experience. A greater percentage were males, were married, and aspired to the principalship. With respect to age and the self-evaluation of potential administrative effectiveness, positive nominees were not unlike negative nominees (teachers who received negative nominations from two or more sources). Negative nominees were older than neutral nominees (teachers classed as neither positive nor negative); compared with neutral nominees a lower percentage of negative nominees wished to become principals.

On the other seven characteristics negative and neutral nominees were not unlike each other.

(3) To what extent is there agreement among the four groups of nominators about which teachers would make potentially effective principals? about which teachers are unsuited for the principalship?

More of the principal positive nominees were found among other nominee groups. It can be said, therefore, that for principal nominees there was the most agreement. Fewer of the supervisor nominees were found among other nominee groups; in fact, a greater percentage of supervisor nominees were identified by one or more of the other nominator groups as unsuited for the principalship. Of the negative nominees, a greater number of principal nominees were found among other groups while the reverse was true for supervisor nominees. It would appear that principals would be reliable members on a team which would help identify potential administrators.

## III. IMPLICATIONS OF THE FINDINGS

One major implication which arises from the findings of this study must be that school systems cannot assume that older married male teachers, possessing wide training and experience, and who desire to become principals, will, in fact, become effective administrators. It must be remembered that many who fit this description were also found in the negative and neutral categories. Of the 22 males who received <u>four</u> positive nominations one was

between 20 and 24 years of age, and two were in the 50-54 years of age category. In training, one had 1 year, while four had 6 years; in the comparable group of negative nominees three had 1 year of training while one had 6 years. Thus these characteristics in themselves, do not necessarily constitute reliable predictors of potentiality; there appears to be many unmeasurable qualities of a person which require an intuitive type of assessment possible after an observation period for example, and procurable through a technique such as nominations.

Of importance to the field is the finding that nearly one-quarter of all the positive nominees did not aspire to the principalship. Further support for this finding is in the fact that not one of the women who received four positive nominations wanted to assume leadership responsibilities at the principal level. One of the first conclusions is that not all potentially effective principals will be found in a self-nominated pool; the second conclusion might be that school systems may have to make the principalship more attractive in order to interest some of the more promising prospects who, at present, hold no aspirations toward that key office.

It would appear entirely possible and perhaps desirable for school systems to broaden and expand procedures for the early identification of future school leaders. To do this, the technique explored in this study might become the basis for such a program.

Certainly rapidly expanding school systems must use all their resources and ingenuity to locate potential leaders early so that these candidates might be screened more thoroughly and given opportunities for advanced study, appropriate experiences, and in some cases even encouraged to consider entering the field of administration.

Through the use of nominations, it is possible that a number of potential leaders would be identified who would not come to the attention of central office personnel early enough so that these persons could be guided in choosing suitable work experiences or pursuing specific university training programs.

To obtain a larger number of opinions from diverse sources would increase the likelihood that the pool, from which appointees would be later drawn, would contain the best possible potential in the system at that time. This study has indicated that other educator groups are not unwilling to assist in the identification program.

The wide interest in the principalship revealed in this study suggests that school systems must be most explicit about the actual selection procedures and criteria for selection. With so many aspiring toward so few job opportunities, staff morale, and job satisfaction may be weakened if policies are vague and capable of misinterpretation.

Further studies, longitudinal in nature, which would study the job effectiveness of various groups of nominees would be very

productive. In addition, should a system choose to adopt a modification of this technique for purposes of identifying potential school leaders, valuable information could be obtained through following the procedures used, data gathered on nominees, and the subsequent follow-up studies. It is hoped that other techniques which assist in the early identification of school administrators will be explored in further studies.

# B I B L I O G R A P H Y

# BIBLIOGRAPHY

## A. BOOKS


American Association of School Administrators' Yearbook, 1960. Washington: National Education Association, 1960.

Andrews, J.H.M. (ed.) The Alberta School Principal, 1959. Edmonton, Alberta: University of Alberta, 1959.

Campbell, Roald F. and Russell T. Gregg (eds.) Administrative Behaviour in Education. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1957.

Cleeton, Glen U. and Charles W. Mason. Executive Ability. Yellow Spring, Ohio: Antioch Press, 1946.

Freeman, G.L. and E.K. Taylor. How to Pick Leaders. New York: Funk and Wagnalls Company, 1950.

Griffiths, Daniel E. Human Relations in School Administration. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1956.

Hemphill, John K. Situational Factors in Leadership. Columbus Ohio: Ohio State University, 1949.

_____ and Alvin E. Coons. Leader Behaviour Description. Columbus,Ohio: Personnel Research Board, Ohio State University, 1950.

Hepner, Harry Walker. Psychology Applied to Life and Work. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1958.

McIntyre, K.E. Recruiting and Selecting Leaders for Education. Austin, Texas: Southwest School Administration Center, 1956.

Neagly, Ross L. Recruitment and Selection of School Administrators. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1953.

Ross, Murray G., and Charles E. Hendry. New Understandings of Leadership. New York: Association Press, 1957.

Scott, W.D., et al. Personnel Management. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1954.

Shuster, Albert H. and Wilson F. Wetzler. Leadership in Elementary School Administration and Supervision. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1958.

## B. PERIODICALS AND UNPUBLISHED WORKS

Andrews, J.H.M. "Recent Research in Leadership," Canadian Education, 13: 15-24, September, 1958.

Bowman, Thomas R. and William W. Savage. "Selecting the Superintendent," Administrator's Notebook, 4: 1-4, February, 1956.

Brodie, T.A. and N.C. Kearny. "Promotions Need Not Be A Problem," The School Executive, 77: 83-84, May, 1958.

Campbell, Roald F. "Research and the Selection and the Preparation of School Administrators," Educational Research Bulletin, 35: 29, February, 1956.

_____ "Selection and Preparation of School Principals," An unpublished address given to the Canadian Education Short Course for Superintendents, Toronto, Ontario, May 22, 1959.

Coladarci, Arthur P. "Administrative Success Criteria," The Phi Delta Kappan, 37: 283-285, April, 1956.

Dean, Harris W. "The Intern for Leadership," The School Executive, 78: 275-281, April, 1956.

"Development of Criteria of Success in School Administration," Agreement for Research Between the United States of America and Teachers College, Columbia University. U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, Washington, 1957, Appendix A, p. 2.

Fowlkes, John Guy. "Epic Document on Training, Selecting Administrators," The Nation's Schools, 61:52, May, 1958.

Graff, O.B. and R.B. Kimbrough. "What We Have Learned About Selection," The Phi Delta Kappan, 37: 294-296, April, 1956.

Griffiths, Daniel E., and L. Iannaccone. "Administrative Theory, Relationships, and Preparation," Review of Educational Research, 28: 351, October, 1958.

Orton, D.A. "Quality of Administrative Behaviour Should Be Target for Change," The Nation's Schools, 63: 50-51, January, 1959.

Preuter, K.F. "Executive Development Within a School System," Canadian Education, March, 1957, p. 30.

Rudman, Herbert. "Preparing Soviet School Officials," Michigan Education Journal, 36: 394-395, April, 1959.

Worth, Walter H. "New Directions in Principal Selections," The ATA Magazine, 39: 11-12, May, 1959.

# A P P E N D I C E S

APPENDIX A. Nomination Form and Biographical Data Sheet.

APPENDIX B. Letter of Authorization - Alberta Teachers' Association.

APPENDIX C. Letter of Authorization - Edmonton Public School Board.

# PRINCIPAL IDENTIFICATION STUDY

## Part A

This study is attempting to identify persons who, after a period of appropriate training or experience, would make very good principals. In arriving at your decision disregard tradition or present regulations governing appointments. Such factors as age, long service, sex and training need not necessarily be considerations that affect your decision; regard those factors, however tangible or intangible, which you feel to be important.

Indicate by means of a check mark (✓) in Column 1, on page 2, which members of this staff, in your opinion, would make very good principals of a school such as this one, after a period of appropriate training or experience.

Indicate by means of a check mark (✓) in Column 2 which members of this staff, in your opinion, would be unsuited for the principalship.

Indicate by means of a check mark (✓) in Column 3 which members of this staff who cannot, in your opinion, be categorized in either Column 1 or Column 2.

DO NOT CATEGORIZE YOURSELF. Leave blanks in each of the three columns opposite your code number.

THE INFORMATION YOU PROVIDE WILL BE HELD IN STRICTEST CONFIDENCE. YOUR IDENTITY IS UNKNOWN THROUGH THE USE OF THE CODE DEVELOPED BY YOUR PRINCIPAL. NO INFORMATION WILL BE REVEALED WHICH NAMES PARTICULAR SCHOOLS.

Thank you for your cooperation. It is very much appreciated.

Column 1 - Very good principal
Column 2 - Unsuited
Column 3 - Neither (1) nor (2)

| TEACHER | 1 | 2 | 3 |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | | | |
| 2 | | | |
| 3 | | | |
| 4 | | | |
| 5 | | | |
| 6 | | | |
| 7 | | | |
| 8 | | | |
| 9 | | | |
| 10 | | | |
| 11 | | | |
| 12 | | | |
| 13 | | | |
| 14 | | | |
| 15 | | | |
| 16 | | | |

| TEACHER | 1 | 2 | 3 |
|---|---|---|---|
| 17 | | | |
| 18 | | | |
| 19 | | | |
| 20 | | | |
| 21 | | | |
| 22 | | | |
| 23 | | | |
| 24 | | | |
| 25 | | | |
| 26 | | | |
| 27 | | | |
| 28 | | | |
| 29 | | | |
| 30 | | | |
| 31 | | | |
| 32 | | | |

PART B

I. Your Name [ ] Use Code

II. Sex [ ] M [ ] F

III. Age
- [ ] (1) under 20
- [ ] (2) 20-24
- [ ] (3) 25-29
- [ ] (4) 30-34
- [ ] (5) 35-39
- [ ] (6) 40-44
- [ ] (7) 45-49
- [ ] (8) 50-54
- [ ] (9) 55 and over

IV. Marital Status
- [ ] (1) Single
- [ ] (2) Married
- [ ] (3) Other

V. Years of training that are recognized for purposes of calculating your salary

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |

VI. Total years of teaching experience (Include 1959-60)

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | |
| 1 | 2-3 | 4-6 | 7-10 | 11-15 | 16-21 | 22-28 | 29 or more |

VII. Years of teaching experience in Edmonton (Include 1959-60)

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | |
| 1 | 2-3 | 4-6 | 7-10 | 11-15 | 16-21 | 22-28 | 29 or more |

VIII. Years of administrative experience (Outside the Edmonton system)

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | |
| 0 | 1 | 2-3 | 4-6 | 7-10 | 11-15 | 16 or more |

IX. Irrespective of present practice and regulations governing the selection of principals, do you wish to become a principal at some time in the future?

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | |
| Yes | Undecided | No |

X. If Yes or Undecided rate yourself on the following scale to describe how effective you believe you would be as a principal.
- [ ] Outstanding
- [ ] Very effective
- [ ] Better than most
- [ ] As effective as most
- [ ] Less effective than most
- [ ] Unsuited

ANSWER EVERY QUESTION FROM I - IX. ANSWER QUESTION X IF APPLICABLE.

THANK YOU.

ALBERTA TEACHERS' ASSOCIATION

Barnett House, 9929-103 Street, Edmonton, Alberta
Telephone GA.2-6155

Official Organ

The A.T.A. Magazine

April 12, 1960.

To Whom It May Concern:

I have carefully examined the thesis proposal of Herman Arnold Wallin. In my opinion it is a worthwhile study and one which may have useful effects in the initial selection of persons to be considered as potential principals.

On behalf of our Association, I would request your cooperation in assisting Mr. Wallin to carry forward this study which, in my opinion, furthers the cause of education.

Very sincerely yours,

ALBERTA TEACHERS' ASSOCIATION

"Stanley Clarke"

S.C.T. Clarke
General Secretary

SCTC:mm

EDMONTON PUBLIC SCHOOL BOARD

10733-101 Street

EDMONTON, Alberta.

April 13, 1960

Mr. H.A. Wallin,
7212 - 96B Avenue,
EDMONTON, Alberta.

Dear Mr. Wallin:

This is your authorization to proceed with your thesis study, as outlined to us, among the members of the Edmonton staff that you have designated.

We feel that you are doing a very worthwhile piece of work and are looking forward to the results of the study. It may well be that this will have important implications for us.

I should point out that the Superintendent, in confirming this authorization, requested that there be no imposition on actual class time in carrying out the work involved.

Yours sincerely,

"M.J.V. Downey"
"per.wp."
M.J.V. Downey
Director of Personnel and Research

MJVD/lcv